

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XXXVII

OCTOBER 22, 1939

No. 884

PHILIP HUGHES

SHOULD WAR IN ITSELF BE CONDEMNED AS EVIL?

COUNSELOR PILLER

NATIONAL GREATNESS IN A CHRISTIAN WAY

STEPHEN J. MEANY, S.J.

AMERICAN CATHOLICS: STOP COMPROMISING!

REV. A. V. LITLEDALE

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HITLER'S NAZISM

\$1.00 a year **Issued Semi-Monthly**
53 Park Place **The America Press**

5c a copy
New York

Win friends and influence people

by introducing them to AMERICA. There are many Catholics and non-Catholics today who are searching for AMERICA and don't know it! Why not put in a good word for AMERICA the next time a discussion of current affairs comes up? Tell them why you think they should read AMERICA.

Tell them to try it for 15 weeks. The price is only \$1.00. We are sure that this is not too much for them, and that they will come back for more.

If you would make sure that we are properly introduced, donate a subscription for them.

It is money well invested!

Subscription Rates:

In the United States ..	\$4.00 a year
In Canada	4.50 a year
Foreign	5.00 a year

Special Introductory Offer - - - 15 weeks for \$1.00

AMERICA

53 Park Place

New York, N. Y.

Gentlemen: Enclosed find Please send

AMERICA for to

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY AND STATE

and oblige

.....

THE CATHOLIC MIND, October 22, 1939. Volume XXXVII, No. 884. Published monthly by The America Press, 53 Park Place, New York. Subscription postpaid United States, 5 cents a copy; yearly, \$1.00; foreign, \$1.25. Entered as second-class matter October 22, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 4, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rates of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1913. Trade-mark "Catholic Mind," Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XXXVII

OCTOBER 22, 1939

No. 884

War and the Christian Tradition

PHILIP HUGHES

Reprinted from The Tablet (London), issue of September 2, 1939.

WAR, nobody will deny, is one of the greatest scourges that can afflict mankind, one of the worst of all the evil consequences of Adam's sin. In a familiar prayer the Church seems to recognize this, asking that we may be delivered "from pestilence, famine and war." But pestilence may come without any deliberate human act, and famine may be the result of natural accidents beyond man's power to control. War, however, is a plague let loose on man by man's activity. It is human wickedness, or human folly, or human stupidity somewhere, which wills war and deliberately sets in train the long series of its noxious activities. War is indeed a terrible thing, and with the universality of Christian tradition we must recognize that it can be, and often must be, taken as the terrible punishment for human wickedness. That God chastizes the nations by war, to correct their iniquity and move them to saving amendment, is a commonplace of man's spiritual history to which we must all give assent. In the Mass prescribed to be said "in time of war" this thought finds forcible expression, when we pray to God "Who by striking dost heal us," and when we ask for

peace that we may make use of it as a corrective remedy. The first act of the Catholic confronted with the actuality of war is surely to look to the supernatural, to examine his own conscience and to accept in penitence for his own sins whatever suffering he sees in prospect for himself.

War has its role in the great affair of mankind's salvation. It is one of the greatest of all trials, and therefore is one of the greatest of all opportunities. Wartime, bringing tragedy and misfortune to all, brings also a more lively sense of human brotherhood, an immense increase of charity and sympathy and, as all must recall whose memory goes back twenty years and more, a new unity of spirit that really makes a nation one great family. Under the terrible pressure of common loss and common suffering men do at last remember that they are brothers and, without effort, begin to act with fraternal love. And these natural good things can be, and in experience are, a thousand times enriched when by acceptance of grace they are transformed into something supernatural. "The dreadful evils that attend on wars" are undeniable, as the prayer we have been saying, for many months now, reminds us. But while the evils are but attendant on wars, the opportunities of grace spring from the very anguish itself.

War is as old a thing as humanity itself, and in primitive times there was no limit to the destruction wrought, save the will and power of the victor for the time being. In battle and after the fight no quarter was shown. That the children of the vanquished should be slaughtered or enslaved, the women ravished, the property pillaged or destroyed, all this was the common form of war. Christianity brought to this ancient institution the immense restrictions which necessarily flow from its doctrine of the immortal, individual, human personality and its indestructible rights. The fact of these rights imposed duties, unescapable, never ceas-

ing, upon all other men and upon the State itself. There must be a limit to what, in time of war, a State could do to the lives, the bodies and the goods of the people upon whom it made war.

But Christianity—the Catholic Church—never condemned war as such. War itself is not a thing evil by its very nature. Dreadful evils may attend on war, and in fact, in this world of fallen humanity where almost all human action shows the taint of imperfection chronic since Adam's fall, dreadful evils always do attend on wars. But war is not itself thereby rendered necessarily and inevitably evil. War is not just massed murder at the command of the State. It is indeed always a most serious physical evil. It is not necessarily a moral evil. War can be just. It can be necessary. It can be duty. Lawful governments have the right to wage war. They may be bound in conscience to wage war. And from the beginning of the Church ecclesiastical authority has been busy setting forth the conditions that make the waging of war a duty, the circumstances that make it a crime, the laws that must be observed if a just war is to be waged in a just manner.

The difficult matter of the morality of any particular war is only a special instance of that ever recurring human problem, the morality of the action with a double result, a good result and an evil result. It is upon the lines of the classic solution of that problem that it must be solved. The object of the action must be the good result and not the evil result. The evil result must not be the means through which the good is sought to be procured. There must be some proportion between the good to be attained and the extent of the evil that incidentally ensues. All this, presupposing always that it is actually a State which proposes to wage the war and not, let us say, a band of private citizens, however numerous and well organized; that the cause for which the war is to be waged is just, a real injury of a grave kind and only reparable by armed

domination of the injuring power. War, thus conceived, is nothing more than the exercise of the virtue of punitive justice.

There is not a single text in the whole of Scripture to hint anything in contradiction with this traditional Catholic teaching. Nowhere is war forbidden simply because it is war. On the contrary, particular wars are singled out for praise, and the heroes of wars are held up for our admiration. Nay more, upon occasion God actually commands His chosen people to make war, and assists them by all manner of special interventions. It would be wearisome to cite in detail the wealth of texts that bear out these statements, as it would be to work through those other texts so often alleged in disproof. It will suffice to note of these last that, in none of them, is there question of the element which is all important when discussing the lawfulness of war as such, namely that it is the act not of individuals but of public authority.

The Fathers, from Tertullian to Saint Bernard, hold faithfully to the tradition, and to Saint Augustine and Saint Ambrose particularly we are indebted for luminous expositions of the morality of war that have determined even the very phraseology in which, ever since Catholic thinkers have discussed it *Bellum geritur ut pax acquiratur*, says the first saint, *Esto ergo bellando pacificus, ut eos quos expugnas, ad pacis utilitatem vincendo perducas*,¹ thus writing to his friend, the governor of Africa, actually preparing a war. One might—the subject is timely—quote Saint Ambrose on the duty of standing by an ally: *Qui socii non repellit iniuriam, si potest, similis est ei qui facit . . .*²; or again on the duty of resisting active wickedness by war: *Malorum impietati favet, qui eis obviare cessat. Qui enim potest*

1 War is waged to achieve peace. Be therefore a man of peace in your war-making, that by your victory you may bring those you attack to a fruitful peace.

2 He who is able to ward off an injury from an ally, and does not do so, is like to the one who inflicts the injury.

*obviare et perturbare perversos, et non facit, nihil aliud est quam favere eorum impietati. . . .*³

As the Middle Ages draw on and the Canon Law takes shape all this traditional teaching is collected and set out in systematic discussion. All the questions which are so keenly discussed today, the general question of the lawfulness of war itself, the hundred special questions as to the morality of particular actions during war time, all these are given careful thought and logical legalistic solutions are offered, with Scripture and Tradition as authorities. Once again war itself is never condemned, but a constant endeavor is made to keep the exercise of the right within the bounds of the moral law. *Quid sit ius militare?*⁴ is the opening discussion in Gratian, to be followed by *An militare peccatum sit?*⁵ and *An iniuria sociorum armis est repulsanda?*⁶

Then came the great schoolmen, Saint Thomas principally, and the tradition received new strength from the philosophic setting in which they placed it, and from the genius with which they conducted their exhaustive analysis of all the ideas involved. In the heyday of the Christian renaissance of the sixteenth century two names above all stand out, for their restatement of the teaching, both of them Spaniards, the Dominican Francisco de Vittoria and the Jesuit Francisco Suarez.

All are agreed that war can be just, and that upon the State which meditates war there lies the heavy charge to assure itself of the justice of the war, its necessity and its timeliness.

This is the duty of "the prince," the man or men actually ruling the State, the executive. What about the duty of us, the rank and file, who are indeed re-

³ Whoever ceases to hinder it assists the wicked man's iniquity. For whoever has the power to stand in the way and throw the wicket into confusion, and does not do this, does indeed assist their wickedness.

⁴ What is the right of war?

⁵ Is it a sin to make war?

⁶ Should one take up arms to resist an injury done to an ally?

lated to the executive in a way that would have seemed unlikely indeed to the theologians who had Charles V and Philip II for their sovereigns? These particular men are the executive today rather than another group because the majority of us chose to have it so by our votes. But though we designated them as those who should wield authority—and among other matters, conduct the foreign affairs of the nation and decide such grave questions as the waging of war—we did not create the authority they wield, nor is it in any way derived from us. All authority has but one source. It is from God. The State in its own lawful sphere is exercising an authority whose origin is divine. In the exercise of its lawful authority the State is to be obeyed, just as the Church is to be obeyed in the sphere of spiritual jurisdiction. In one special matter the Church indeed enjoys not only a right to our obedience, but infallibility. Such infallibility is nowhere attached to the State's exercise of its authority. But we are not therefore free, whenever private judgment moves us, to disregard the State exercising its lawful authority any more than we are free to disregard the Church outside the sphere of its infallible teaching.

Unless we are *certain*—that is to say, moved by the possession of knowledge of facts really ascertained—of the injustice of a particular war our own State is about to wage, we must obey the State, putting our doubts and opinions to one side. We must obey not as a matter of choice, nor because we agree or accept the Government's point of view, but as a duty: the presumption being that the State has access to more information than the private citizen, and the fact being that upon the State is the responsibility and duty of government. It is for the State to decide. Apart from that *real certainty of fact* that the war is unjust, one thing only can justify resistance to the State's view of things, and make it a duty of conscience to resist, and that is a declaration from the Church, as guide of the

morals of mankind, to the effect that the particular war is unjust.

War is a relation of nation to nation, and not of the citizens of the one nation as individuals to the citizens of the other nation. It is not lawful therefore, in time of war, for individual citizens to kill, maim and plunder the subjects of the other power. The enemy whom it is lawful to attack with arms, and therefore to kill if necessary, comprises only those taking an active part in the hostilities. All others—not only the civilian who continues in his civil occupations, his womenfolk, his children, but all those who accompany the actual fighting men, such as doctors, nurses, chaplains—all these, from the point of view of the right to make a directly intended assault, are neutrals. And this not as a matter of favor, or chivalry, or sentiment, but in justice. Directly to attack them is grievously wrong.

It may happen, it must of course happen, and even happen often, that in the chance circumstances through which a war proceeds, combatants and non-combatants are often in such quasi-permanent proximity that an attack on the one cannot but involve the others. This is an old problem of war morality, and again its solution is along the classic lines of the action with a dual effect. But what is always forbidden is the infliction of harm beyond what is needed for the victory, a flat-sounding commonplace which covers such one-time practices as the torturing of civilians to extract information, the massacre of the wounded or of prisoners and many a like horror. And where agreement has been made to not use certain especially cruel or murderous weapons, it must be kept.

At this moment there are Christians facing perils unknown to their forbears for many long centuries. They face these new perils, however, as true Catholics and Christians. Death is not any more death because it comes in some blinding sudden descent from the air.

Whatever moment death finds us it is God's moment for us. *Consummatus in brevi* says the Church, quoting Holy Scripture to limn briefly the lives of youthful saints, *explevit tempora multa.*¹ Peace, "the most beautiful of all God's gifts," is indeed a gift. It is something the world, life, cannot give. We do something towards meriting it when we consent to give life in a sacrificial, penitential spirit, that evil may not, with a protest, triumph.

National Greatness

COUNSELLOR-OF-STATE PILLER

Fribourg, Switzerland

Reprinted from La Croix (Paris), August 23, 1939.

IN our days, the question of national greatness is of urgent moment. We are living in a period of change, and that forces us to face realities, to go back to fundamental notions.

So that we may grasp quite clearly the idea of the nation, it is here to be understood in the sense of the organized structure of one's fatherland, and it is in that environment that we are considering man. Man is the crown of creation, he is also the servant of God. His real greatness consists in doing the Will of God. That is to say, by raising himself towards God he is also raising the universe towards God. And so that he may attain that end, every institution is at his disposal. Their lawfulness is based upon a single principle: To serve man, in order that he might the more truly become man and the more easily realize his end.

The greatness of that form of collectivity which is a nation, will be estimated therefore by the way in

¹ Being made perfect in a short space, he fulfilled a long time.—Wisdom iv. 13.

which it helps man to increase in stature, to raise himself up to God; in facilitating the expansion of his powers; in responding to the necessities of his material life; in permitting him the realization of his religious aspirations. In short, in assuring the harmonious development of five activities: science, art, actions, economic activity, religion, which constitute the foundations of civilization.

This obligation to place oneself at the service of man is conformable to the very nature of things. It is therefore of obligation on every national community throughout all time, and on every continent. But each individual nation perfectly realizes that general end according to special methods or ways of putting forward this or that factor of civilization, following on circumstances or events. In other words, each nation, just as each man, has its own vocation. Are not occasions the teachers which God gives us from His hand?

Each people should know that it has a vocation. It should labor to work that out clearly, and to realize generously the real content of that vocation. Because if it fails in its vocation, it is hindering God's plan and impoverishing humanity. So that the more the vocation of a nation is realized, and the more its citizens give to that realization their intelligence, their hearts, their powers, the more that nation becomes great.

Since it is events and circumstances that indicate the vocation of a nation, it is obvious that no nation can arbitrarily pick and choose the elements of its greatness, any more than a man may, as it suits his good pleasure, choose his vocation. Immediately from that there emerges this conclusion: the individual, the nation or people have no right whatsoever to puff up themselves with conceit because of the vocation which is theirs.

If the vocation brings in its train certain obligations which do not appear to be very dazzling, these are none the less indispensable and, if they are de-

votedly carried out, they also become highly meritorious. Now these obligations should, in their performance, add a lustre to the commendation which their very fulfilment could, at any given moment, gain for a people carrying out such obligations. They ought to add luster in the doing to the supreme end, to which must be subordinated every particular end, which is to make available to all the members of the nation every means possible to accomplish their end and vocation.

Then there is another outcome of the principle which follows herewith: it is an error to attribute any sort of superiority to the inhabitants of any country, as such, merely because that country has a greater or a higher mission. There are duties of the most distinguished order; there are also other duties or obligations that are not of so distinguished an order. That much is perfectly true. But it by no means detracts from the fact that true greatness lies in the quality of soul which is brought to the carrying out of a duty. Selfhood, moreover, is not the high point of achievement. The vault of heaven is vast enough, as well as high enough for every nation to find in it its living space, and be raised on its material foundations to shape and bear its people towards God and at the same time realize its own true greatness.

National greatness presupposes a minimum of force. National greatness does not identify itself with force nor, moreover, with extending its territory or the number of its inhabitants. It is from its own inwardness that it enriches itself. The greatness of a nation depends upon the intensity of its spiritual irradiation. It will be all the more perfect as it places in the forefront values that are intrinsically the highest, values of which it once has taken possession it can never be robbed, but rather greatly enriched.

Everything can contribute to the greatness of the nation—every sacrifice, every act of generosity, as well

as every difficulty and every struggle. Mr. Etter, the President of Switzerland, said on the national feast day: "Happy is the danger which allows a people to become conscious of its mission, of its spiritual greatness, of its power. Happy the danger which leads a people to the firm resolution to defend its liberty, its independence, and the mission confided to it by God."

There is one statement which is not out of place here: it is the normal and legitimate thing that every man should put in the first place in his affections the nation of which he is a part. In a very great part that nation has shaped him, and furnishes him normally with the environment that is best adapted to the realization of his end. And so, if he clings to it, it is not on the ground that his nation is better than any other nation, but because it is his own nation.

All the considerations presented thus far might be summed up thus: Man is bound to attain his end. To reach that end, he ought to have at his service diverse communities and their institutions: Family, nation, humanity, Church. And the source of the greatness of each of these is expressed in the one word *Serve*. To serve is the ultimate reason for the existence of every man and every institution. That concept alone allows the realization of the common good, everything that favors the expression of the person. It is not just by mere accident that the Holy Father claims for himself the title of Servant of the Servants of God.

Every fatherland or nation is placed in its own particular circumstances. But each one of them have one common end: to be at the service of man, each according to its own proper mission, which is discharged according to its own mode of action. Each fatherland and nation has its own unmovable place in God's scheme, and everyone has the obligation to carry out the acts of God (*gesta Dei*), towards which each individual inhabitant has his own contribution to make. Hence Christian educators are those who, by their pro-

fession, are called to watch over the soul of youth and over the soul of the nation. Their mission is far-reaching in its extent, for they have the mettle which builds up, which gives life. So their mission in life is one that is both to be envied and at the same time admired.

Do American Catholics Compromise?

STEPHEN J. MEANY, S.J.

THE Catholic attitude in these Protestant United States has generally been an attitude of compromise. This will be readily conceded by those whose daily pursuits have thrown them into the company of a mixed society composed of Catholics as well as Protestants. Countless people will bow their heads upon reading these lines and admit that their habitual policy in regard to religion has been "Leave religion for Sunday mornings." This policy has been carried out by some to such a degree of success that even their closest associates in business or other weekly pursuits have never discovered the startling fact that they are members of the Catholic Church.

This attitude is evidently a throw-back from the dark ages of American history when there flourished in our midst such illiberal isms as Knownothingism, the Ku-Klux Klan, the A.P.A., or just plain bigotry carried from the domain of religion into the every-day current of worldly affairs. In those days, to be a Catholic was to be at a disadvantage; it was difficult for a Catholic to secure a "genteel" position, or having secured one it was harder to gain advancement. Catholics could hardly be blamed for hiding the fact of their Catholicism from all but their families and their closest friends.

From this attitude of concealment there naturally grew up an attitude of compromise. People sooner or later discovered that their esteemed associate was a Catholic! Then one had to explain! "Do you mean to say that you are a Catholic? And that you take orders from the Pope in Rome?" "Well, of course the Pope is the Head of the Church and he is infallible and all that, but after all he *is* in Rome and we have our own American Bishops." "You say that the Pope is infallible. You know as I do that that is ridiculous!" "Well, he is only infallible in matters of faith and morals." "Since you bring up the question of morals, do you really think the Church is right in such questions as divorce, and birth control?" "Well, I will admit that the Church is pretty strict in those matters, but if She says so that is good enough for me." And so American Catholics have for years been parrying the blows aimed at themselves and at their Church, rarely managing to put over one jolting blow of offense. Such word-battles have passed with the Catholic having defended himself and his Church, bravely but not too well, while the enemy departs still thinking he is the better man.

There would seem to be no reason today for the policy of concealment, and as a matter of fact the majority of Catholics are today proud of their religion and even eager to boast of the fact that they are Catholics. But the policy of compromise remains as our American Catholic heritage. It is, to put it plainly, time that we renounce that heritage, time that we renounce compromise, time that we take the positive attitude following the words of our Divine Founder, "Go ye and *teach* all nations."

An honest appraisal of the history of the Church in the United States should be enough to convince one that the compromise attitude has failed entirely to win over those outside the Church. Recent events in connection with the Spanish conflict reveal the dis-

quieting fact that the world still fulfils the promise of Jesus Christ "... because you are not of the world ... therefore the world hateth you." Oh, but the non-Catholic world does not hate Catholics today! If it does not hate Catholics, then how explain hateful actions where Catholics and the Catholic Church is concerned? How explain the non-Catholic support of the Loyalist cause in Spain? We have read the complaints of Mrs. Roosevelt and Dorothy Thompson against the "merciless bombing of defenseless Spanish babies"! But no tears were shed, nor have they yet been shed, over the killing of 14,000 Spanish priests and nuns. How explain the letter of the Protestant clergymen to the Bishops of Spain, and the letter of 450 Protestant clergymen to the Holy Father begging him to stop Franco's "reprisals." Franco must not win in Spain, because with him the Catholic Church would win. American Catholics may just as well be convinced that "the world will hate you" as it "hath hated me before you."

A hymn of hate was sung some weeks ago on the first page of the second section of the *New York World-Telegram* under the title of "Cut That Scene." The headlines alone over this series of articles tell the whole story: "Pressure Groups Tell Hollywood What to Cut—And It Is Ordered"; "Hollywood Scared Silly of Pressure"; "Producers Urged to Fight Back at Pressure Groups That Demand Censorship." Now the world is aware that the Legion of Decency was the result of a nation-wide movement under the leadership of the Catholic Church; this series of articles does not name the Catholic Church, nor Catholics in general as the "pressure group"; but one of the articles does narrate the action of the Knights of Columbus in objecting to the film "Blockade"; it tells how Catholics picketed the Radio City Music Hall where this picture was being shown; and it quotes Archbishop McNicholas of Cincinnati on the subject.

The
most
view
J
plea
Ame
Ame
wher
Cath
pass
to st
them
Divi
Mot
Sacr
natu
way
to c
"Do
sake
com
Let
non-
bea
mor
goir
mea
frie
fall
test
But
pro
is 1

The Catholic Church is evidently the "pressure group" most to be fought against because it is "forcing its views of morality on the nation"!

John E. Reardon recently stated in *America* while pleading for *Active Leadership (of Catholics) in American Catholic Culture*, "The Catholic task in America will make even greater advances than it has when Catholics have begun to give people of the non-Catholic culture an active leadership rather than a passive conformity, when Catholics will have begun to stress more the things on which they disagree with them rather than the things on which they agree—the Divinity of Christ, the Divine Paternity, the Virgin Motherhood of God by Mary, the Real Presence, the Sacraments, Heaven, Grace, Hell, and the whole supernatural content of Catholicism." The world will always hate the reformer,—until the reformer manages to convince the world that what he advocates is not "Do this; don't do that," but rather "Believe this; forsake that belief." There is something hateful in mere command or prohibition; there is beauty in faith. Let Catholics, then, in any exercise of a new spirit of non-compromise show the non-Catholic world the beauty in those Catholic beliefs on which Catholic morality is founded.

Let us drop the compromise! This does not mean going around with a chip on one's shoulder. It merely means expressing the teaching of the Church in a friendly way, even where it hurts, and let the chips fall where they may! It is perfectly true that the testimony of a good life will gain friends for God. But more often a good life is looked upon as a reproach, until the beholder perceives that the good life is founded on a bedrock of solid truth.

Nazi Philosophy

REV. A. V. LITLEDALE

Reprinted from the Catholic Gazette (London), September, 1938.

THE name, National Socialism, is new, and it is, therefore, natural to think that the idea and the program for which it stands are, equally, of post-war origin, the result of the economic and political depression of Germany, the almost exclusive creation of the imagination and driving power of Adolf Hitler, the founder of the Party. Thus, some would blame the peace treaties, others Communism, for the creation of the Nazi program; while the enemies of the regime sometimes speak as if the death of the leader, and perhaps one or two others, would involve the extinction of the system. Such a view would be most misleading. Without denying the influence of the peace treaties and the powerful factor of Hitler's personality, the Nazi philosophy (*Weltanschauung*) is far from being merely a reaction to certain conditions of a temporary nature. Its essential factors can be discerned as a continuous, powerful, and half-hidden current surging through the German development, though only occasionally appearing on the surface as a tidal wave—the latest, and the most violent, being Nazism.

The characteristic of the German genius is a certain wideness of vision which is able to view things synthetically, that is, as parts of a whole, a sense of unity in which the parts are integrated, and from which they draw their significance. This is shown in the German language with its innumerable compounded words, and with its sentences so massively built up and compacted—a marvelous medium of forceful expression. And this language differs from the

other great languages of Europe in having few words of foreign importation, and is, therefore, the spontaneous expression of the German soul. The geographical position of the German people, with their uncertain boundaries, a more or less fluid mass in the middle of Europe, made them more sensible of the unity of that Continent, and less of the sharp division of the separate nations. So it was that France and Spain achieved national unity centuries before Germany, whereas the latter held on to the idea of the Holy Roman Empire long after it could be realized. The same "universalistic" tendency is seen in the German philosophers, for example, in Hegel, who considered the whole of reality and the whole of history as the Absolute progressively achieving self-consciousness and realizing himself; also in Karl Marx, with his interpretation of history as the triumph of the proletariat working itself out in accordance with fixed laws.

Now, this synthetic power of thought, the ability to see the one in the many is very necessary, both in theory and in action. We know how Europe suffers from its acute divisions and the loss of that sense of unity which it had in Catholic days. We know what evil had resulted from the divorce of moral from economic science, not to mention of physical science in general from sound metaphysics. But the danger of this faculty of generalization is the failure of the power of analysis, which is the power of reasoning, of neglecting certain facts for the sake of the system, and of building, as we say, "in the air." In practical life, this will be shown by the neglect or denial of personal or collective rights which stand in the way of the unification to be imposed. True philosophy, such as Scholasticism at its best, uses in due proportion analysis and synthesis; and the true ordering of society incorporates all groups in the whole without destroying the properties of each group—that is the corporatism of Pope Pius XI. Thus, Marxism is false through its defective

analysis of human motives and through its neglect of factors which are opposed to it. And National Socialism is bad, because, in the interests of an absolute unification, it overrides, with systematic ruthlessness, and crushes, whatever claims to live by its own right.

National Socialism is, then, the German power of synthesis expressed in a perverted form, and carried to its highest degree. It applies both within and without the German Reich, though in both spheres its principle is the supremacy of the German Volk, or people considered as one throughout space and time. Within the Reich this means, in practice, the supremacy of the State, the organ of the Volk, and, in particular, of the Führer, in whom the spirit and will of the Volk is considered to find the most complete expression. This knowledge of the Führer's "mission" is not, of course, arrived at by any rational process, but is a quasi-mystical intuition on his part, and admits of no opposition. The State being the interpreter and the executor of the "eternal destiny" of the German people, everything which concerns that destiny falls within its scope. Consequently, the word "political" embraces, or can be made to embrace, all that affects the people, whether science, art, or religion, and, if any of these seek to affect the people in a way different from what the State conceives to be in their interest, then it can be accused of encroaching on the sphere of politics. This is the explanation of the charge of "political Catholicism." It is not merely a trumped-up charge designed to cover acts of hostility to the Church. The charge is, in fact, true, taking "political" to cover that wide field which it does in the Nazi view. In this view, whatever belongs to or affects the people as such—that is, as a single entity—belongs to politics, whether it be in the order of thought or of action. Thus, it belongs to politics exclusively to fix the norm of education; and though, at present, religious functions in Church are considered to be private, and are therefore, for the ordi-

nary people, unhindered, they are logically at variance with the system. In fact, a form of "political" religious service seems to be steadily evolving, which precedes important demonstrations. It is called *Führerverehrung* (strictly worship, perhaps only veneration, of the Führer). There is a reading from *Mein Kampf*, a few minutes' silence, in which they "think on the Führer," an address, a hymn. And listeners to the Nuremberg Party Congress will notice the solemn recitation of those, from 1922 to the present, killed for the Nazi cause—a Nazi Martyrology (it includes, of course, the two executed for the murder of Dollfuss). All this in addition to Rosenberg's liturgy. No doubt, then, it is designed to supplant Christian forms of worship in due course. There is no room for an independent Church. The situation recalls the quarrels between the medieval Empire and Papacy, though, of course, the Emperors, with the exception of Frederick II, were always Catholic in sentiment.

Internally, this process of unification will be completed when all Germans are absorbed into the one Reich, and all their activities fall under the one control. But the process does not end there, but flows beyond the frontiers, having as its principle the "destiny" of the German race to dominate all others. This is based upon the view that, of the different races of men, some are intrinsically superior to others; of these, the Jewish is the lowest, the Aryan the highest, the others occupy various stages in between. This theory is inherited by National Socialism, chiefly from the writings of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the son-in-law of Richard Wagner; and, already in 1903, another writer had affirmed that, on this ground, "we, Aryans, Germans, are the born masters of other peoples." The rejection by biologists, even Germans, of this race-theory makes no difference. In fact, there can be no objective science in the National Socialist Reich; all knowledge is pragmatic—that is, only that can be ac-

cepted as truth which is felt to be in harmony with aspirations of the German soul. Hence, the intellectual decline of Germany. A distinguished scientist of Cambridge said that he had been obliged to discontinue his subscriptions to German periodicals he had taken for years, as now they had ceased to have any scientific value. So no amount of reasoning, no refutation on grounds of philosophy or ethics, can halt the drive to supremacy exercised in the name of the German people. It is an irrational subconscious urge which is felt to be superior to reason, and which carries all before it.

This irrational, quasi-mystical character is what makes the movement so dangerous; for, once men have discarded reason, they perforce assimilate themselves to the brutes ("*homo, cum . . . non intellexit, comparatus est jumentibus insipientibus*") and are only amenable to force. Also what vitiates the movement is that it is the perversion of something excellent in itself—*corruptio optimi pessima*. This good is the unity of Europe, and of mankind, but it can only be achieved on the principles of reason and the Christian revelation, not on a false mysticism backed up by force. Within the Reich, much good has been done, however its enemies deny it. Usury has been checked, money made subservient to the State instead of vice-versa, unemployment abolished and the lot of the worker improved, workers formed into Labor fronts with their own representatives who negotiate in cases of dispute, thus approaching a corporative order. But all these are in the order of means, and they are perverted by being ordered to an evil end, the domination of an anti-intellectual, anti-Christian, and therefore barbaric, philosophy.

with
ellect-
ist of
tinue
taken
ntific
n on
ve to
ople.
to be
.
what
have
elves
mpa-
only
ment
nt in
the
y be
stian
orce.
er its
oney
ersa,
im-
their
oute,
hese
d by
anti-
aric,

POETRY

POETRY

MINT BY NIGHT

By Alfred Barrett

Here is an attractive collection of forty-seven lyric poems by one of the country's leading Catholic poets.

"With Alfred Barrett poetry is not *belles lettres*. It is life and spirit. There are at least four poems in his collection that no Catholic anthology worthy the name will hereafter find it easy to omit."—*SPIRIT*.

Beautifully Bound

Price \$1.50

"AMERICA" BOOK OF VERSE

Edited by Francis X. Talbot, S.J.

234 selected poems from the pages of *AMERICA* by such well-known names as Leonard Feeney, Katharine Tynan, Francis Carlin, Thomas Butler Feeney, Aline Kilmer, Cathal O'Byrne, Theodore Maynard, Mary Dixon Thayer, Clare Gerald Fenerty, William Thomas Walsh, Myles Connolly.

In a new binding

At a new price—\$1.00

THE AMERICA PRESS

53 Park Place

New York, N. Y.

Theological Studies

A Quarterly devoted to scientific and technical theology. It includes all branches of theology.

Among the contributors to the pages of THEOLOGICAL STUDIES will be found some of the best-known theological authorities of the English-speaking world.

One of the chief purposes of the new review is that of developing theological research among English-speaking theologians, and of serving as a medium of exchange for their findings.

The editorial direction of THEOLOGICAL STUDIES has been entrusted to the Reverend William J. McGarry, S.J., Ph.D., S.T.D., Lic.S.S., until recently President of Boston College, Boston, Mass. Assisting him is a board of departmental editors selected from the American Theologates of the Society of Jesus.

Subscription Rates:

In the United States . . \$5.00 per year; \$1.25 per copy
Foreign \$5.50 per year; \$1.50 per copy

First Issue—February, 1940

THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

Care of The America Press
53 Park Place, New York City

Gentlemen: Please enter the following name on your list for a year's subscription to THEOLOGICAL STUDIES:

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY AND STATE

Please send bill ☐

Enclosed find